

## REMARKS

Claims 1 is objected to because of informalities.

Claims 1 and 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher US 6003787 in view of Ritchie US 2750071 and Jones US 1644338.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher in view of Ritchie and Jones and in further view of Kirch US 3977602.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fisher in view of Ritchie and Jones and in further view of Stonecipher US 2657166.

Fisher essentially discloses a device which is powered with a compressor. This teaches away from the present invention, which purpose is to avoid any sort of electrically power input to operate the device. The Examiner refers to columns 3 and 4 of the Fisher reference to disclose the use of gases beside air. However, close inspection of this language in columns 3 and 4 reveals that in fact there is no clear disclosures of other gases. It is said in oblique reference to other gases, while at the same time contradicting such disclosure by the language "air flow through the nozzle could also be generated by other means such as liquid carbon dioxide bottles." This is consistent with the entire disclosure, which discloses air flow, not other gases. There is no issue of freezing involved with this reference. There is no pressure reducing structure, and no effort to prevent freezing.

Ritchie is a tire-filling apparatus. This reference has no disclosure of anti-freezing structure.

Jones is a fire extinguisher, which is not adaptable to a spray gun apparatus. It is non-analogous art. In the disclosure, it is stated that the pressure reduction is to zero-gauge pressure at the outlet. This follows from the fact that it is a fire extinguisher which simply disperses the material into the atmosphere without a spray gun apparatus. In contrast, the present invention is arranged to provide adequate pressure for a spray gun apparatus.

The Stonecipher reference discloses chlorinated compounds, which is contrary to the present invention.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant asserts that all of the Examiner's objections have been satisfied, and therefore now respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections and allowance of the application.

**PETITION FOR AN EXTENSION OF THE TERM**

Applicant petitions the Commissioner for a three-month extension of the terms from 15 November 2007 to 15 February 2008. Accompanying this response is \$555 to cover the cost of the extension. Any overpayment or underpayment should be credited or charged to deposit account no. 04-2219 referencing our docket number 14901.

Respectfully submitted,

/Keith H. Orum/.....

Keith H. Orum  
Attorney Registration No 33985  
Attorney for Applicant

**Orum & Roth LLC**  
53 West Jackson Boulevard  
Chicago, Illinois 60604-3606  
Telephone: 312.922.6262